

## **REMARKS**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1 and 34 have been amended. Claims 13, 16, 19, 22-24, and 40 – 44 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1 – 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 25 – 39 remain pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable.

### **II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claims 1–12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 25– 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hume (U.S. Patent No. 4,854,721).

Claim has been amended to recite a “position sensor device for determining a position of a reciprocating object, comprising: a plurality of magnetically encoded regions fixed on the reciprocating object; a plurality of magnetic field detectors; and a position determining unit; wherein the plurality of magnetic field detectors is adapted to detect a sequence of signals generated by the magnetically encoded regions when the magnetically encoded regions reciprocating with the reciprocating object pass surrounding areas of the magnetic field detectors; wherein the position determining unit is adapted to determine a position of the reciprocating object based on the detected sequence of magnetic signals, and *wherein at least one of a first condition, a second condition, and a third condition is fulfilled, the first condition being that the magnetically encoded regions have different lengths along a reciprocation direction, the second condition being that the magnetically encoded regions are provided at different distances from one another, and the third condition being that positions of the magnetically encoded regions are provided in a non-symmetric manner with respect to the magnetic field detectors.*”

It is respectfully submitted that Hume does not disclose the above-emphasized recitation of claim 1. Hume discloses several types of signals such as an activation signal to provide a driving voltage and a control signal to cause the pistons to reverse direction. However, these signals are conventional ones used for different purposes. Hume further discloses one related to

a magnitude of the strength of the magnetic field. However, Hume, in its entirety, does not disclose or suggest any of the three conditions outlined in claim 1.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Hume does not disclose or suggest the above-emphasized recitation of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 – 4, 7 – 12, 14, 15, 24, 25, and 33.

Claim 34 recites limitations that are substantially similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 34 and its dependent claims 35 – 39 is requested for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 14, 2012

  
By: \_\_\_\_\_

Oleg F. Kaplun (Reg. No. 45,559)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP  
150 Broadway, Suite 702  
New York, New York 10038  
Tel.: (212) 619-6000  
Fax: (212) 619-0276